REMARKS

Claims 1-56 were pending. Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 20, 25, 31, 36, 45, and 47 have been amended. Claim 6 has been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-56 remain pending subsequent entry of the present amendment.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

In the present Office Action, claims 1-22 and 25-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by newly cited reference U.S. Patent No. 6,144,375 (hereinafter "Jain"). However, Applicant submits each of the pending claims recite features not disclosed by the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the above rejections and requests reconsideration.

For example, claim 1 recites a method for processing broadcasts which includes:

> "periodically storing broadcast meta-data corresponding to each of one or more of the received plurality of perspectives of the program, said meta-data comprising at least time and/or offset information for each of the corresponding one or more plurality of perspectives."

However, Applicant has reviewed the portions of Jain cited by the examiner and submits Jain does not disclose periodically storing time and/or offset information for each of the perspectives of the program as recited in the claims. Rather, Jain discloses storing multi-media data types in a multi-media database and storing video clips. For example, Jain discloses:

> "...The system 300 thereby creates a database that synchronizes and associates multiple multi-media data types (such as video, audio, proximity sensor signals, and statistical information) with multi-media events of interest to an end user or client (such as fumbles,

interceptions, etc.). These data types are stored ... in a relational object-oriented multi-media database." (Jain, col. 20, lines 4-13).

"In one preferred embodiment, a highlight reel is defined as a set of "important" or extraordinary plays (i.e., video clips) ...The highlight reel is "published" by the highlight reel publisher 306 and provided as input to the inventive viewer method and apparatus 400 ... in one preferred embodiment of the present invention, the highlight reel is published to the well-known Internet to be subsequently obtained by the viewer process ... the inventive viewer process 400 executes on a computer located at a user/client's home or business." (Jain, col. 16, lines 10-22).

Additionally, Jain discloses the use of filtering criteria, and not the use of time and offset information, in the following:

"In the example of an American football program, the capture/filter process 304 accepts as input all of the video data streams provided by each video camera positioned proximate a football field. Additional inputs are provided by the setup process 302 and by additional data sources 318." (Jain, col. 19, lines 9-13).

"In order to automate the creation of the highlight reel, the setup process 302 provides a set of pre-defined filtering criteria as inputs to the capture/filter process 304." (Jain, col. 16, lines 62-65).

"... the following filtering criteria can be specified: (a) scoring plays (such as touchdowns, field goals, safeties, and two point conversions); (b) erroneous plays (such as interceptions, quarterback sacks and fumbles); (c) extraordinary plays (such as 4.sup.th downs that are not punts, passes and rushes greater than a specified number of yards, (d) key players can be specified (e.g., record all passes that player X caught), and (e) other user-defined plays. In the preferred embodiment, the filtering criteria can be established using Boolean operations based upon a set of primitive filtering constraints." (Jain, col. 20, lines 21-31).

Jain further discloses the use of system user commands in the following:

"The system user interface 320 also allows a system user to aid the capture/filter process 304 in filtering the raw input and thereby

creating a multi-media database. For example, in one preferred embodiment, the system user provides inputs that define event starting and ending points by providing "record" and "stop" control inputs to the system 300. The control inputs also include "delete", "save", and "override" controls." (Jain, col. 19, lines 36-43).

While Jain does disclose the use of a time clock, this time clock is used as filtering criteria (318 in Fig. 4 and Fig. 6), which is described above. Additionally, Fig. 6-A discloses the video streams are input to block 317, and time clock, which is output by block 318, is not dependent upon the video streams. Time clock here refers to time of a football program and not time of each perspective of a program. Jain discloses the time clock in the following:

"Additional inputs are provided by the setup process 302 and by additional data sources 318. An example of an additional data source in the football example is a "Stat. Crew" data stream comprising continuous "play-by-play" statistical data associated with the football game under view. Examples of Stat. Crew data include derived statistical information such as "yards per carry" for a particular player, completions and interceptions for a particular quarterback, etc. Game clock information can be recovered from the Stat. Crew data stream." (Jain, col. 19, lines 12-21).

"In addition, a Stat. Crew computer 318 provides statistical information (such as the time clock) to the CS 304 as described above." (Jain, col. 21, lines 25-27).

For at least all of the above reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited art.

Further, Applicant has reviewed the following portions of Jain cited as disclosing these features, but can find no such disclosure. The citations are discussed below.

Col. 25, line 44 – col. 26, line 1+

This disclosure merely describes the display of favorite video events on a display in Fig. 7. A convenient access to the favorite video events for the system user is provided

via the display and a possible cursor. This disclosure merely mentions multi-media events are sequenced on a global system timeline, but does not describe any use of meta-data such as time information for each perspective of a program. The multi-media events may be created by filtering criteria or system user commands as descirbed above. However, storage of meta-data for each perspective of a program is not disclosed.

Col. 27, line 33 – col. 28, line 1+

This disclosure merely describes displaying a best view of an object, player or event to the user. The criteria used to find a best view may include the proximity of the camera to the object, the direction of travel of a selected object, manual operation from the user, etc. As discussed above, event starting and ending points may be defined by user inputs (i.e. "record" and "stop" control inputs) or filtering criteria. However, the storage of meta-data for each perspective of a program is not disclosed for either determing a best view or determining an event.

Further, claim 1 recites "automatically determining a second point in time in the second perspective, wherein the second point in time comprises an approximation of the first point in time in the program". Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and submits there is no disclosure of determining an approximation of the first point in time in the program. The cited portions in the Office Action suggested to teach these features instead teach a user interface for selecting different perspectives of a program, VCR controls for altering the display in the video window, and presenting a best view of a particular object, player or event. No disclosure is included that describes determining a second point in time in the second perspective of the program by approximating a first point in time in the first perspective. Since this second point in time of the claimed invention is not taught in the cited reference, the claimed features "presenting the portion of the program from the second perspective to the viewer beginning at the second point in

time" is not disclosed either. For these further reasons, claim 1 is patently distinguishable from the cited art.

In view of the above, Applicant submits claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least these additional reasons. As each of independent claims 15, 20, 31 and 45 include features similar to those of claim 1, each of these claims are patentably distinct as well. As each of the dependent claims includes the features of the independent claims on which they depend, each of the dependent claims are patentably distinct for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, all claims are distinguishable from the cited art.

In addition to the above, the dependent claims recite further features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. For example, claim 8 recites the additional features "wherein identifying the first point in time in the first perspective comprises identifying a first offset in a stored file corresponding to the first perspective". The same portion of Jain recited as disclosing the features of amended claim 1 is cited as disclosing these features as well. However, as already discussed earlier, this disclosure of Jain merely describes the display of favorite video events on a display in Fig. 7. Also, it describes multi-media events are sequenced on a global system timeline, but does not describe any use of meta-data such as time information for each perspective of a program. The multi-media events may be created by filtering criteria or system user commands as descirbed above.

Claims 11-12 recite particular features regarding the determining of the second point in time in the second perspective of the program. There is nothing in the entirety of Jain that remotely resembles such features.

Claims 13-14 recite features directed to offsets in relation to MPEG I-frames. Jain simply states that video clips stored in the system database are encoded using a well-known video encoding and compression method. However, Jain discloses nothing concerning the offsets or approximated offset as recited in the claims.

Still further, claim 56 recites features directed to interpolation which is nowhere disclosed by the cited art.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the present Office Action claims 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,165 (hereinafter "Abecassis"). However, according to at least the reasons stated above for traversing the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections, the features of these claims are not disclosed or suggested by the combination of cited art.

Information Disclosure Statements Not Returned

Applicant notes the following information disclosure statements which were filed, and which appear as having been received on PAIR, have not been signed and returned. Applicant requests the examiner initial, sign, and return each of the information disclosure statements previously submitted on the following dates: November 12, 2004; March 24, 2005; and May 10, 2006. Applicant also requests the information disclosure statement submitted May 7, 2007 be signed and returned.

In view of the above, Applicant submits all claims are patentably distinct from the cited art. Therefore, the application is believed in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5266-05200/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,

____ / Rory D. Rankin / _____
Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
    Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: August 15, 2007